



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,726	02/14/2001	Mihal Lazaridis	1400-1072 D2	7167
82297 7590 03/16/2011 The Danamraj Law Group, PC/RIM Attn: Reba Pieczynski Premier Place, Suite 1450 5910 N. Central Expressway Dallas, TX 75206				
EXAMINER				
STRANGE, AARON N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2448				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/16/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

portfolioprossecution@rim.com
uspto-inbox@danamraj.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/783,726

Applicant(s)

LAZARIDIS ET AL.

Examiner

AARON STRANGE

Art Unit

2448

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 102-109, 111-118 and 120-129 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 102-109, 111-118 and 120-129 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :20100830;20101014;20101119;20101229;20100221.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/27/2010 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/27/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. With regard to claim 102, and Applicant's assertion that "AirMobile is inherently and inescapably incapable of real-time redirections of user data items" (Remarks 15-18), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's arguments rely primarily on the disclosure of Eggleston (US 5,764,899), which Applicant asserts provides additional explanation of the AirMobile system (Remarks 16). For the purposes of this response, this assertion is assumed to be true, and AirMobile and Eggleston will be discussed in reliance on the assumption that they disclose the same system.

AirMobile clearly discloses a "push" type system for notifying clients of incoming e-mail messages. AirMobile explicitly recites "messages are 'pushed' put to your portable PC from the server over the wireless network: you do not have to constantly

call in to check for messages" (p. 31, ¶1) and that upon arrival of a new message, "AirMobile software will immediately download the message to your laptop" (p. 31, ¶3). AirMobile clearly distinguishes this "push" model from a conventional "client pull" model, because AirMobile implements both models (p. 30, ¶6). These portions of AirMobile make it clear that in at least one embodiment, newly received messages are pushed out to a client device, without requiring the user to call in and check for messages.

Eggleston discloses three major components of the redirection system, a client 105, a communication server 110 containing a Virtual Session Manager (VSM) and a host server 115 (fig. 1). Eggleston discloses that the mobile client and the VSM maintain a sessionless communication path (col. 2, ll. 54-56) and the host system and the VSM maintain a session-oriented communication path (col. 2, ll. 57-58). This permits the client and VSM to communicate on an event driven basis without requiring a connection to be maintained (col. 4, ll. 30-40). In contrast, the VSM and the host server "maintain the same session ... that the client typically enjoys when connected to the LAN/WAN" (col. 4, ll. 44-47). Using this architecture, the client can "achieve a virtual session with the host" (emphasis added) (col. 4, ll. 47-51).

Eggleston does disclose that the Query Manager and VSM, in combination, query the host for unread messages (col. 5, ll. 53-57; col. 6, ll. 58-65) at predetermined intervals (col. 8, ll. 3-9). However, at no point does Eggleston disclose clients generating queries.

4. With further regard to claim 102, and Applicant's assertion that Eggleston and AirMobile "requires that a mobile device first establish a virtual session, which can be random and intermittent, thereby negating any notion of transmitting the messages to the mobile device in real-time" (emphasis added) and that "absent an active virtual session, no messages can be requested by or sent to a mobile device" (Remarks 18), it unclear how Applicant believes Eggleston's use of a virtual session differs from the claimed invention.

Establishment of the virtual session used by AirMobile and Eggleston is simply the mechanism by which the VSM becomes aware of the existence of the client and ensures the client is authorized to receive messages. A virtual session is "active" as long as the client is available to receive messages (i.e., the client is located in a coverage area and has its modem powered on)(Eggleston; col. 7, ll. 34-40). The client need not re-register with the server unless a timeout period has elapsed without any data exchange (Eggleston; col. 7, ll. 44-58). To prevent this timeout from expiring, the client periodically sends a "short message" to the VSM to keep the virtual session alive (Eggleston; col. 7, ll. 50-54).

The virtual connection is only "random and intermittent" to the extent that coverage of wireless networks and the ability of a user to power a mobile device on and off are random and intermittent. No language in the present claims precludes re-establishment of a connection with the redirector by a device, after leaving and re-entering a wireless network coverage area or the device being powered off and back on. If Applicant intended to claim a system where the redirector indefinitely forwards

messages to devices, regardless of their availability, the claims should be amended to require those features

5. With further regard to claim 102, and Applicant's assertion that "Eggleston logs off the user and tears down the virtual session so that the costs of communication are kept to a minimum" (Remarks 19), this argument mischaracterizes the purpose of tearing down the virtual session. The first two portions of Eggleston cited in support of this assertion (col. 4, ll. 47-51 and col. 7, ll. 10-10) discuss the cost savings received from the sessionless data flow provided by the virtual session, and have nothing to do with tearing down the virtual session.

The third portion of Eggleston cited in support of this assertion (col. 7, ll. 48-58) does tearing down the virtual session, but it does so in the context of an expiring timeout value reached when the client is "no longer receiving" due to leaving the coverage area or being powered off (col. 7, ll. 33-58). The teardown is performed only when the client fails to send any communication to the VSM before the timeout expires, not in response to any concern about costs beyond those associated with the "inefficient use of resources" (col. 7, ll. 33-37). The client automatically sends this "keepalive" message prior to expiration of the timeout (col. 7, ll. 50-54) to prevent the client from being logged off.

The fact that Eggleston stops attempting to notify unavailable devices does not "teach away" from real-time redirection of data items. As long as the client is available, the virtual session will be active and messages will be forwarded to the client in real-

time. It is obviously impossible to notify devices when they have no signal or are powered off. Furthermore, no language in the current claims requires the redirector to forward messages to unavailable devices in addition to available devices. The claims merely require processing a copy of a single data item and sending that data item to a mobile device in real time, features which are taught by AirMobile and Eggleston.

6. With further regard to claim 102, and Applicant's assertion that "Eggleston terminates an established session once a user has been logged in long enough to raise costs to a threshold" (Remarks 20), Eggleston clearly discloses that this is an optional feature, and that "[i]f a user is privileged, data transfers would still continue despite the user limit having been exceeded" (col. 14, ll. 53-54).

7. In summary, one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood both AirMobile and Eggleston to disclose systems that notify clients of incoming e-mail messages using "push" type notification that notifies the client without requiring the client to poll for new messages. The "virtual session" used by AirMobile and Eggleston is different from a conventional system which establishes a session, polls for new messages, and terminates the session. The "virtual session" is maintained so long as the mobile device is available and uses event-based communication to immediately forward new messages to the mobile device using a push-based notification scheme, without requiring the client device to poll for messages.

The current claims do not preclude the use of sessions, virtual or otherwise, between components of the system, and use of the sessions taught by AirMobile and Eggleston do not prevent the use of push-based notification of new messages, since both AirMobile and Eggleston use push-based notification schemes.

While Eggleston discloses that the VSM polls the host server for new messages, Carthy teaches that automatic, fully asynchronous notification of incoming messages was a well-known and advantageous alternative to polling for incoming messages. Therefore, the current claims fail to contain any limitations sufficient to distinguish them from the prior art of record.

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 102-109, 111-118 and 120-129 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-50 of U.S. Patent No. 7,386,588. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they recite substantially identical subject matter. Claims 1-50 of U.S. Patent No. 7,386,588 contain all the features of the present claims except processing a copy of the data item rather than processing the item itself. It was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to perform operations on copies of user data to ensure that the original is retained unchanged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

10. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11. Claims 122-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

12. Claim 122 is directed to a "computer-accessible medium", a term not defined by the specification. The broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to a machine readable medium, or other such variations, covers forms of non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals *per se* in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable medium. When the broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim covers a signal *per se*, the claim must be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as covering non-statutory subject matter. *See In re Nuijten*, 500 F.3d 1346, 1356-57 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (transitory embodiments are not directed to statutory subject matter).

The Examiner recommends amending claim 122 to add the limitation "non-transitory" to overcome the above rejection.

13. All claims not individually rejected are rejected by virtue of their dependency from the above claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

14. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

15. Claims 113-118, 120 and 121 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

16. Regarding claim 97, the claim elements "means for processing an automatically generated notification", "means for processing a copy of the user data item" and "means for causing to send", are each means (or step) plus function limitations that invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. However, the written description fails to disclose the corresponding structure, material, or acts for each of the claimed functions.

The specification appears to describe each of the functions performed by these means as being performed by "redirector software 12" (See e.g., pp. 12-15) which is "operating at the user's PC" (see ¶26 of the specification amendment filed 1/17/2009) or at the "server 11" (see ¶40 of the specification amendment filed 1/17/2009).

The specification discloses only a "general purpose computer" (the user's PC or server 11) running a "redirector program", without including a description of the algorithm that transforms the general purpose computer into a special purpose computer programmed to perform each of the claimed functions. Applicant must disclose the algorithm that transforms the general purpose microprocessor to a special purpose computer programmed to perform the disclosed algorithm that performs the claimed function. See *Aristocrat Technologies, Inc. v. International Game Technology*, 521 F.3d 1328, 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Applicant may express the algorithm in any

understandable terms including a mathematical formula, in prose, in a flow chart, or in any other manner that provides sufficient structure. *See Finisar Corp. v. The DIRECTV Group Inc.*, 523 F.3d 1323, 1340 (Fed Cir. 2008).

Applicant is required to:

(a) Amend the claim so that the claim limitation will no longer be a means (or step) plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or

(b) Amend the written description of the specification such that it expressly recites what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function (i.e., the algorithm that the general purpose computer executes to perform the claimed functions) without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)) or relying on documents incorporated by reference.

If applicant is of the opinion that the written description of the specification already implicitly or inherently discloses the corresponding structure, material, or acts so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function, applicant is required to clarify the record by either:

(a) Amending the written description of the specification such that it expressly recites the corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed function (i.e., the algorithm that the general purpose computer executes to perform the claimed functions) and clearly links or associates the structure, material, or acts to the claimed function, without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or

(b) Stating on the record what the corresponding structure, material, or acts, which are implicitly or inherently set forth in the written description of the specification,

perform the claimed function (i.e., identify the algorithm that the general purpose computer executes to perform the claimed functions). For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2181.

17. All claims not individually rejected are rejected by virtue of their dependency from the above claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 102-104, 106-113, 115-122 and 124-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile (Software for Lotus cc:Mail Wireless, Communication Client Guide, Motorola, 1995) and Carthy et al. (MAPI Developers Forum post "MAPI Notification" April 12, 1996; hereinafter Carthy) and Eggleston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,899, hereinafter "Eggleston").

20. With regard to claim 102, AirMobile discloses a method of pushing user data items from a messaging host system ("communication server") in real-time delivery to a

wireless mobile data communications device that is associated with a user having a mailbox at the messaging host system (p. 9, "Communication Server," p. 10, "User Profile Database," pp. 15-16, wherein mail is received and stored at the communication server, and the mail account is associated with a mobile device according the device ID), the method comprising:

receiving a notification at a redirector component indicating receipt of a user data item by the messaging host system, where the notification is received in response to receipt of the user data item at the messaging host system (newly received messages are immediately downloaded when the arrive)(p. 30-31);

processing the user data item at the redirector component to add address information associated with the wireless mobile data communication device (required for delivery to the mobile client)(g. 31, ¶1-3);

causing to send the user data item to the wireless mobile data communication device over a wireless network (messages are pushed to the portable PC)(p. 31), whereby the user data item is pushed to the wireless mobile data communication device in real-time (messages are "immediately downloaded when they are received") (p. 30)

While AirMobile discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it fails to specifically recite 1) that the notification is automatically generated in response to receipt of the user data item and 2) transmitting a copy of the received electronic message.

With regard to point (1), AirMobile fails to specifically recite that the notification is automatically generated in response to receipt of the user data item. AirMobile discloses a server side push technology (pg 31 ¶ 1-3), where the server learns of incoming messages and sends them to the client without receiving a request from the client. While the Examiner believes that the broadest reasonable interpretation of an "automatically generated notification" received by the redirector component includes a notification generated responsive to a polling messages received from the redirector component, using a "push-type" mechanism for notifying the redirector component of a message received at the messaging host system would have been an obvious modification to AirMobile at the time of Applicant's invention.

Carthy discloses an e-mail system where the notification of new messages in a user's mailbox is sent automatically, as opposed to polling, using an extended MAPI IMAPAdviseSink notification (See the Carthy post describing "full asynchronous" notification in extended MAPI). Carthy further disclosed that in order to receive these automatic notifications the system must register with a software interface associated with the messaging server (i.e. registering with the ImsgStore to receive adviseSinks). Cathy also disclosed that automatic notification is preferable to polling (See posting by Stephane Cohen).

This would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by AirMobile since it would have permitted the redirector to be notified of each incoming message without requiring the redirector to poll the mailbox of each user, conserving

resources on the redirector since by eliminating polling, which is particularly advantageous for mailboxes that infrequently receive messages.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the automatic notification functionally disclosed by Carthy within AirMobile's system to reduce the resources needed by the redirector.

With regard to point (2), AirMobile discloses forwarding messages received at the messaging server to the wireless device. However, AirMobile does not explicitly state that the messages forwarded to the wireless mail system are a copy of the original message.

Eggleston teaches a system for forwarding messages from a LAN-based host through a wireless host to a mobile client device, wherein the LAN-based host stores messages, thereby maintaining a replica of the messages, before forwarding them to the client (col. 4, lines 44-51; col. 12, lines 32-39, 59-62, wherein the messages are copied and maintained at a host system, and are also sent to target units). This would have been an advantageous addition to AirMobile in the unlikely event that such a feature is not already present, since it would have allowed received messages to be retained on the server to ensure they are not lost and may be accessed from other locations.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the mail replication feature taught by Eggleston in the mail forwarding system taught by AirMobile and Carthy to

ensure that mail messages are not lost and may be accessed by multiple mobile devices if desired.

21. Claims 113 and 122 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 102, since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

22. With regard to claim 103, AirMobile disclosed the redirector component is operating on the messaging host system (pg 9 "communication server" and pg 31 ¶s 1-3).

23. With regard to claim 104, AirMobile disclosed the' redirector component is operating on a host system that is couple to the message host system via the network (e.g. the Network file server cc:Mail Postoffice works in tandem with the Windows AirMobile server pg 9).

24. With regard to claim 106, Eggleston disclosed that messages sent between the wired and wireless systems can be compressed (col. 11, lines 63-67). Given this knowledge, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to compress the messages, prior to transmission to the gateway, and to decompress the messages at the mobile device, as suggested by Eggleston, in order to increase

available bandwidth and to provide faster and less expensive communications (see Eggleston, col. 12, lines 7-9).

25. With regard to claim 107, AirMobile disclosed the processing step further comprises encoding the copy of the user data item (e.g. transforming a message into the required transmission protocol for the wireless network being utilizing prior to pushing a message to the user) (additionally compressing as set forth with regard to claim 106 is a form of encoding).

26. With regard to claim 108, Examiner takes official notice that the Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions protocol was widely known and used to communicate email messages between devices at the time of Applicant's invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to encode messages using the MIME protocol within AirMobile's system in order to communicate messages between devices using a known reliable protocol.

27. With regard to claim 109, AirMobile disclosed the user data item is an email (pg. 38, "Sending/Transmitting e-mail messages").

28. With regard to claim 111, AirMobile disclosed the step of causing to send the copy of the user data item to the wireless mobile data communication device over the wireless network further comprises causing to send the copy of the user data item via a

wireless gateway disposed between a wide area network and the wireless network (see pg 9, Figure 1-1, a gateway is required to interface between the networks).

29. With regard to claim 112, AirMobile disclosed the step of storing the user data item at the data store associated with the messaging host system (p. 9, "Communication Server," p. 10, "User Profile Database," pp. 15-16, wherein mail is received and stored at the communication server, and the mail account is associated with a mobile device according to the device ID).

30. Claims 113, 115-118, 121, 122, and 124-129 are rejected using a similar rationale as applied to claims 102-104, 106-109, 111 and 112.

31. Claims 105, 114 and 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile Server (AirMobile Wireless Software for Lotus cc:Mail, Communication Server Guide, Motorola, 1995), in view of AirMobile Client (AirMobile Wireless Software for Lotus cc:Mail, Communication Client Guide, Motorola, 1995), and Carthy et al. (MAPI Developers Forum post "MAPI Notification" April 12, 1996; hereinafter Carthy) and Eggleston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,899, hereinafter "Eggleston") and further in view of Murota (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,105).

Note, the AirMobile Server and AirMobile Client guide present different aspects of the same system, and are therefore are treated as a single system for the purposes

of this rejection. They are hereinafter referred to together as "AirMobile" with specific citations to the Server • guide as "AirMobileS" and the Client guide as "AirMobileC."

32. With regard to claim 105, 114 and 123, AirMobileS disclosed sending messages from the cc:Mail server to the mobile device in a secure fashion (AirMobileS, p. 25, bullet 1 "secure and authenticated virtual wireless communication channel between your laptop and your LAN-based cc:Mail server") however, AirMobile does not disclose using encryption for sending messages in a secure fashion. Nonetheless the use of encryption to send messages securely was widely known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention, as evidenced by at least Murota.

In a similar email system, Murota disclosed encrypting e-mail messages between a sender and a receiver, wherein a message is encrypted at the sending end, is then transmitted over the network to the receiving end, and is finally decrypted at the receiving computer (col. 1, lines 23-48). Murota further disclosed that such an encryption scheme is advantageous because it prevents leaks of secret information to outside, non-intended parties (Murota, col. 1, lines 49-53).

Thus, given the teaching of Murota, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention include an encryption function, as taught by Murota, in conjunction with the redirector component of AirMobile such that messages sent between the AirMobile server and mobile devices are encrypted, in order to prevent outside parties from having access to secret or classified messages.

Conclusion

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON STRANGE whose telephone number is (571)272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron Strange/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2448